G. R. S. 58]

*Previous references.*

File No. 30-98-99.

1898-99
(Sep. Rec.)

Serial Nos. 1– 14

*Later references.*

51

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

---

*Serial Nos.* 1– 14

Major Part B for June 1901

---

SUBJECT.

Claims for compensation preferred by Paloo Singh and Gangaram Sait, licensees of separate arrack shops and vend farms in the Bowringpet & Malur T.

---

Sl 1 From. Gangaram Sait. Contractor of arrack shops
Petn. No 1208 D/ 12-1-99
Prays that he be ordered to sele arrack at Sooni Cuppam in lieu of Nooni Venkatappa

Sl 2 To The Excise Comr
Det 603. D/ 25-1-99
Forwards the above for disposal

Sl 3 From. Paloo Sing & Gangaram Sait
Det no 140. D/ 14-7-99
Pray for the remission of heavy loss they have sustained for the whole year

GPB—5,000—22-10-10

Sl 4 To The Ex. Comr. in Mysore.
Ref No 70. Dt 25-7-99.
Forwards the above for disposal

Sl 5 From Paloosing & Gangaramsait.
Ref No 1340 Dt 8-1-1900
Invites attention to the previous petn for remission of the loss they have sustained.

Sl 6. From The Ex Comr. in Mysore
Dy No 4708/Ex 208 Dt 9-1-01
Submits a Compensation Statement for 2039-3 for sanction and transmission to the Comptr for audit in favor of the petitioners

Sl 7 To The Ex Comr & The Comptr m. c
No 6076-7. Dt 13-2-01
Sanctions a Compensation of Rs 2039-3-0

Sl 8 To The petitioners
No 6078. Dt 13-2-01
Informs that a Compensation of Rs 2039-3-0 has been sanctioned in their favor

Sl 9. From Paloosingh and Gangaramsait.
Petn No 1866. Dt 18-3-01
Prays that an opportunity may be given them to represent the Complicated matter to Govt by an advocate, as they are illiterate and that after perusal of the records a further reasonable concession may be shown them

Sl 10 To The Excise Comr. in Mysore No 7894/Ex 389
Dt 2-4-01
Forwards copy of the above for report on the several allegations therein made with the entire records of the Case

Sl 11 From The Ex. Comr in my case
Dy No 7005/Ex 313 Dt 15-4-01

Submits reports on the petn of the above petitioners (in Sl 9 supra) praying for the concession

Sl 12 To The Excise Comr (Dt 28-5-01) The Comptroller. M.C. No 9548-49 Ex F 10-99
Agrees with the opinion of the Ex Comr to the effect that the petitioners are not liable to any more concession and informs rejection of the petn

Sl 13 To Palo Singh & Gangaramsait No 9550 Ex F 10-99 28-5-01
Informs that the petition is rejected

Sl 14 From the same persons.
Petn No 8828/Ex 498 Dt 26-6-01
Pray that they may be returned all the papers that they filed in connection with petn No 6078/Ex 296.

B Hanumantha Rao
Countermarked

SR 3079 8-

SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

REVENUE BRANCH

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT. Compensatem claimed by Paloosing and Gangaramsah, licencees of certain arrack shops in the taluks of Bowringpet for 1898-99 for and realer ~~[illegible]~~ of the loss alleged to have sustained by them on account of the prohibitem of certain gabras & fairs comprised within their contract area, during the prevalence of plague

REFERENCE Letter No._____ dated_____

from_____

pet reg^d nos 120 & 3 January 99
and 140 & 140 & 14th July 99.

On complaint made by Paloosing and Gangaram sah, licensees of certain arrack shops in the taluks of Bowringpet and malur for 1898-99, that they suffered a heavy loss of Rs 20 491-1 in all, owing to the evacuatem of several villages and the prohibitem of many important fairs and gabras having been ordered by Govt

on account of the prevalence of plague the matter was referred to the Excise Commr. and he in his letter under reference reports as follows :—

(1) that, in accordance with the correct figures available in this office, the licensees have actually sufferred a loss ~~to the amount~~ of Rs 18,303-11-4 (vide statement marked (C) in the Excise Commr's letter.

(2) that a greater portion ~~of the~~ (viz Rs 13090-13-0) of this loss was due to the licensees having bought the shops & vend farms at a loss in the face of the previous years statistics of consumption, evidently for a mere speculation and not for any profit to themselves Statement marked B.

(3) that therefore the only remission they can claim for is Rs 18,303-11-4 — Rs 13090-13-0. or Rs 5212-14-4

(4) that most of this loss again is due to the licensees not having made proper arrangements

3

for the ~~pass~~ sale of arrack during the prevalence of plague in their contract area

The Excise Commr further states that the petitioners are however entitled to compensation on account of the prohibition of certain gabras & pairs compressed within their contract area and that the amount of such compensation calculated on the average consumption of arrack during the three previous years amounts to Rs 2039-3-4

A compensation statement for Rs 2039-3-4 is accordingly submitted for sanction

Submitted

KG
29/11/04.

Sd/- K. the Seal

4/2/04

These men came me yesterday
and represented that
they had a strong case,
that the Greek towns had
not come fully into it &
taken a correct view of
it & that they were anxious
to the Queen an opportunity
of being heard - that is
a matter for the Ld
(in consideration - & he
he decides upon hearing
them, notice of the date
& place will be given
them & the entire record
called for -

Colonial Office
5/12/07

I thank the
Secretary for his
courtesy in proposing
I should hear the
petitioners, but
the Officer can any member
in charge of the Finance
Portfolio may have
his own view of the
question. I do not
like to hear & then
have my recommendation

expect ~~to~~ by the
Mr Devan either
Today or in Consultation
with ~~the~~ the other
Commissioner. It will
simplify matters
if the papers are
placed directly before
the Mr Devan for
disposal. There will
be some finality
in the order

V Bhaskaranadan
6/2/1901

Secy to Mr Devan
9
7-2-01.

1653/ I regret I am unable
to agree with my Colleague
for not doing what
he is required to do
under the Council Rules
in regard to matters
referred to him for

I suggested to common but merely brought to the Dpt a representation made some by the Circuit

11/2/07.

I/ I differ with the Secretary - I would simply endorse the recommendation of the Secretary Commr

10/2/1907

Draft as ... Dept

11-2-07.

Put in for draft

(Office note continued)

In accordance with the above order a compensation of Rs 2039-3- was sanctioned in Govt proc. No 6076-7 dt 29-5- dt 13th February 1901, an endorsement having also been granted to the petitioners to that effect. It is with reference to this endorsement, the petitioners ~~submit~~ make a further representation and pray that the records of the case may be perused and further concession shown them.

30/3/07

Please send the file.
and petition to the
Queen's Proctor for a report
on the recent allegations
that have been made to him
with a view to the withdrawal
of the record and the
petition.

30/3/07.

~~Application~~

Note. The order caught by the
reserved rule stopped on
the Queen's Proctor's report
on the absence of the record.

30/3/07

(Office note continued)
vide next page.

Not received back
Since received.

As directed, the above petition was sent to the Excise Commr. for a detailed report with the entire records connected with the case. The Excise Commr. in his reply letter No. 5413/276 & 15th April 1907 under disposal, states that, for various reasons assigned therein, he is not inclined to recommend any further concession in favor of the licensees, as any concession shown to petitioners would form an inconvenient precedent.

The record received is so disconnected that no continuous history of the case can be given - The file does not also contain ~~the orders~~ & several papers referred to in the various

reports as however apparent
that the licensees have suffered
a heavy loss of 15000 to 20000 Rs/-
which is reported to be due to
petitioners careless management

A precis of papers is
also submitted

Submitted to Secy GL
5/5/07

KG
4/5/07.

To the 2nd Jr
7/5 Hrs

The petitioner who had
wished to be heard seems
to have left the office
under the impression
that I would have no
time to hear them today
Please request them
to come in the office
on Tuesday next

Petr made a general plea
for mercy but
was unable to show
that that
appeal
will succeed - GL
14/5/07

Exc.
Complete please
11/5 Hrs 11/5/07.

I agree with the Govt
Counsel that no exemption
or refund can and should
be already sanctioned
by way of concession
is admissible - Petr's

Precis of papers

in the case of compensation prayed for by Pyluswy and Sangaram sait, licensees of certain arrack shops in Bowringpet and malur, for 1898-99

Papers marked 1

Pyluswy sait, arrack shop keeper of separate shops nos 9, 10 & 12 in the Oorgum village, Kolar Gold Fields, for 1898-99, in his petition dated 10th October 1898 ~~[illegible]~~ presented that ever since he took up the contract (from 1st July 1898) he had been suffering loss and more so since the removal of "Shandy" (fair) from Oorgum to Swornakoppa, on account of plague, and prayed for permission to keep his shop no. 12, in the 'Shandy' on Shandy days He also stated that as per

statement enclosed he would
lose
~~gain~~ annually, Rs 12,732/-
The petition was referred to
the Superviser, Bowringpet Range
for report as to whether there
was any objection to grant
the petitioners request. The
Superviser reported that since
the removal of the Shandy from
Oorgum to Swarnakoppa, the
sales in all the shops of Oorgum
declined proportionate increase
having occurred in the Swarnakoppa
shops and recommended that
as there were two other licensees
~~owning~~ owning shops in Oorgum,
~~that~~ each of the 3 licensees
might be allowed to have
his shop on Shandy days
by turns so that there might
be no room for any complaint.
The Deputy Commr approved
of the arrangement proposed
and directed that each of
the 3 contractors should
hold his shop at Shandy
until further orders

One Moonevenkatappa
(Moonevenkatasamiah) licensee
of arrack shop at Swamakoppa
Complained against this order
on the ground that the sales
in his shop were greatly affected by the
opening of additional shops
in the Shandy by Pyllusing
and others by turns and the
Dy. Commr. thereupon directed
that Moonevenkatappa be allowed
to keep a shop on the monthly
Shandy day (Saturday) which
was held once a month
Pyllusing appealed in his turn
to the Excise Commr. against
the last order and prayed
that permission granted by
the Dy. Commr to Moonevenka-
tappa, shd be withdrawn
and the petitioner allowed the
privelege of vending in the
Saturday Shandy as well.
The petition which was sent
to the Dy. Commr. for report
was referred to the Sirkari

Superviser, who reported that the sales in the petitioners shops were gradually improving & that owing to the petitioner's failure to carry on business with due care and attention, he suffered loss. On this report, the Deputy Commr declined to pass any further orders in the matter

Similarly, Pylusing Saib, who was also the arrack vend farmer of the Malur taluk for 1898-99, represented that owing to the prevalence of plague the village people prevented the vendors from entering their villages when once they went out to bring arrack from depôts located elsewhere, that consequently the vendors ran away causing heavy loss to the petitioner and that therefore he could not pay up his monthly Kists from

November 1898 and prayed that for the amount due from him till the end of October, the actual sale proceeds of the shops might be accepted in full satisfaction of the arrears. The Superviser was thereupon directed to report on the case together with a statement showing the sales and the amount of loss sustained by the licensee up to November 1898. The Superviser in his report No 242 dated 5th January 1899 stated:—

that as per statement enclosed the contractor suffered loss

2 that it was also true that the villagers prevented the vendors from entering again the villages when once they went to fetch arrack from depôt to elsewhere, but that the amildar was asked to warn the patels

and Shanboguls who did so

3 That arrangement was made to supply arrack to the shops in the malur Taluk from the Bowringpet Depôt, besides removing the malur depôt from its original place to the Taluk Cutchery compound

4 That as by this arrangement the distance from which arrack is to be brought increased, the vendors declined to get their supply from there, nor did the contractor supply the vendors with the required quantity of liquor considering that it would result in a loss and that owing to the reduced sale, the Govt would lost duty on arrack

5 That the contractor did not pay up his Kists for December 98

6 that the contractor closed some of the shops for some time, thereby causing loss to Govt

On the above report the licensee was first ordered to be prosecuted under the Rule but on subsequent representation made by him the case ~~file~~ was withdrawn and he was ~~cautioned~~ departmentally fined Rs 50/- for breach of the license rule

By Commrs order dated 7th April 1900

Subsequently again petitioned the License Commr in his petition dated 12th April 19 ~~as follows~~ and prayed for remission of the amount of loss sustained by him for the following reasons:—

The prevalence of plague and plague measures.

2 Removal of shops from their original localities to places distant from the congum village

3 Stoppage of business in the new shops in the new localities ~~away to the~~ where the vendors were harassed by robbers & vagabonds,

The above petition which was referred to the Dy Commrs for report, was sent to the Supervisor who in reply submitted a statement of consumption of arrack showing a decrease of 3500 gallons in the several shops of the petitioner during the two months of the year 1898-99 as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year

/

papers marked 4.

The Supervisor in his report no 10 dated 8th July 1899 to the Deputy Commrs states ~~that~~ that the shop from

the Inspector Cantonno answers to the several queries put in the Excise Commrs's letter No 7715/162 dated 30th May 1879. The Inspectors report runs as follows —

× not in the record.

That when the plague prevailed the vendors of the Lakkur, malur and masti and Tornahalli shops ran away and that he appointed separate vendors for them on payment of a commission

That Lakkur shop was kept closed for 10 days as no vendor was immediately available

That in the case of Tornahalli shop as no one agreed to vend without the consent of the Jodidar there was some delay in appointing a vendor to that shop

That the malur shop was opened after the plague subsided there, and

That the prosecutions case failed

against the licensee (Pylusing)
for omission on his part to open
the shops under the terms of the
license rules, was as directed
withdrawn

petition Regd no 140. marked 5

In their petition dated 14th
July 1899 to Government, Pylusing and Ganparamsait,
for a remission of Rs 20491-1-4
the amount of loss sustained by
them on their several arrack
shops in the Gold Fields, Bowringpet
and in the Malur Taluk on the
following grounds.—

prevalence of plague in
all the above places and ~~prev~~
plague preventive measures
such as the prohibition of Jatras
fairs &c

~~preventing of vendors from~~
~~entering the villages~~
~~prohibition of people~~
prohibiting people from
entering villages infected
with plague & the consequent
desertion of vendors without
even paying the advances

made to them

removal of shops from
their original localities
to outside the towns

—

papers marked 6 & 7.

The Excise Superviser
was directed in the Dy Commrs
order no 173/3 dated 27th July 1899
to submit a statement for the
information of the Excise Commrs
showing the actual loss sustained
by the petitioners, certifying to
the various items of expenditure
alleged to have been incurred
by them and in reply ~~the Super~~ he
(Superviser) reported that according
to the actual realizations, the
licensees have sustained a
loss of Rs 17044-9-4 and
not Rs 20,491 as shown in
the petitioners statement, that
as compared with the previous
years consumption there was
a decline in consumption

of Rs 4028 ℔s resulting in
a loss of Rs 4957-1-4,
that their bud for the year
was over and above the estimated
realizations and that owing
to the virulent form of plague,
the Gatras & fairs were closed,
the ingress & egress of people
from one village to another
was prohibited & consequently
the vendors deserted the shops
and ran away.

papers marked 8

The Excise Commr
No 1582 & 23.8.99
in his docket 37 to the Dy Commr
requested the Dy Commr
to obtain the statements from
the patels & Shanbogues of the villages
concerned as to whether it was
true that ~~the villagers~~ Tornahalli Inamdar
presented the transport of arrack
into the villages during the
time of plague what shops
were kept closed & for what
period and under what circumstance

A statement was accordingly obtained from the Inamdar who deposed before the Amildar of Malur, that at first the village people objected to the intenders resorting to the arrack shop in the Inam village lest they infect the village with plague that as this was not heeded the shop keeper was advised to keep his shop outside the village, and that in the meanwhile the vendor closed the shop & ran away the Todey Inspector who visited the place afterwards - pacified the people and got the shop opened by a new vendor

paper marked 9

In reply to the Dy Commrs orders no 422 dated 20th September 1899, the Excise Supervisor of the Bowringpet range reported as follows—

(1) The prosecution case against the licensee was as directed withdrawn

and that ~~no mention~~ in the charge sheet
the name of the particular shops
kept closed was not mentioned

(2) that on the objection made
by the villagers to allow
arrack shops being opened
lest people come from infected
localities, necessary in-
structions were issued by
the Amildar to have the
shops located outside the
villages concerned

(3) that "some shops" referred
to in the Dy. Commr's memo
dated 27th March 1919 might
probably mean Lakkur and
Sonahalli shops and that ~~the expression~~
"about 1½ months" ~~or was~~ was
not the exact number of days
during which the shops
were closed, but the expression
~~des~~ denoted only the
approximate ~~number of days~~
period

4 and that the arrack vend
farmer never made any
exertion to ~~get~~ make proper arrange-

ments ~~made for the sale of~~
arrack for selling arrack
in his several shops

Paper 10

In reply to their petition
praying for remission of Rs 20491/7
(as per statement enclosed)
the loss alleged to have sustained by
them, the licensees were informed by the Dy. Commr., Kolar
that they should represent
their case to the Excise Commr
and they accordingly applied
to the Excise Commr. (petition
dated 18th January 1900) and
prayed that favorable orders
may might be passed in
their case.

paper marked 11

who directed in the Dy.
Commr's order no 392 dated
13th August 1900, the Excise
Supervisor (with his report no 421
& 10th September/00) submitted
a compensation statement for
2039-3 (prepared in accordance
with the instructions referred)

on account of the loss incurred
by pyluring salt consequent
on the prohibition of
certain fabrics &c—

papers marked 12

Pyluring salt and
Gangaram salt, wreck ship
Contractors Bombay, for
Rs 99-99 in their petition
(Q 21st September 1900) that
no relief was given to them
in spite of several representations made
about the heavy loss
of nearly 30000/- incurred
by them owing to plague &
plague preventive measures
that the present Superviser
has underestimated
their loss in as much as
the assessment was not based
upon proper data and that
the former Superviser, who was
an eye witness to the petitioners
sufferings might be referred
to on the subject—

Excise Supervisors memo
dated 15th April 1901

paper marked 13

The Excise Supervisor who was in charge of the Bowringpet range in 1898-99 states as follows :—

(1) that during the year 1898-99 the petitioners held two separate shops at Bowringpet

(2) that owing to plague when people were ordered to camp out, arrangements were also made to locate the all arrack shops including those of the petitioners, near the sheds so as to enable the licensees to carry on their business

(3) that the Railway passengers who were sent to Health camp were not the usual customers of the shops

(4) that similarly, when plague broke out in the

Malur Taluk, the arrack shops were ordered to be located close by the sheds put up by the villagers outside their villages ~~and the same~~ were but not removed to Kunglee as alleged by the petitioners.

(5) That similar arrangement was made in the case of Oorgum shops by locating them near the sheds ~~of the~~

(6) That only 30 cooly sheds were removed from Oorgum to Swamakoppa and that by calculating on an average 3 drinkers for each hut, the aggregate loss of 1334 gallons has been entered in the Compensation statement submitted in favor of the Licensees.

KS
4/5/01

Sub
2R, Stamp affixed to Pet"

To Ex Comm' for
disposal
21/1/99
Not Boof Too
23/1/99

1899 (1)

No. 1208

Name of Petitioner Gangaram Sheth
Contractor of arrack Shops

Village Oorisaram

Taluk Bowringpet

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 12. 1. 99

Date of Receipt 12. 1. 99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2

ABSTRACT

The petitioner states that he has Contracted 5 arrack shops for Rs 28,000, that he has sustained a loss of Rs 6676-3-6 as the Shandy which was to be held on Sunday has been transferred to Soornikuppam, that the Dy Comr ordered that the petitioner may open a Shop on Sundays and abridged on Saturdays in the Shandies, that one moonivenkalappa is allowed to sell arrack in Soornicuppam, that all the Shandies are conducted near his shop in Soornicuppam since September that by the Change of Shandies he has sustained heavy losses, that the advent transfer of the

Cooly lines to Soonnuppam
has increased Moonu Venkatappen
Sales, whereas it has decreased
the petitioners Sales

Prayer that he be ordered
to sell arrack at Soonnu
Cuppam in lieu of Moonu
Ven catappa

Enclosures

1 Converse copy of petition
2 ~~List~~ of Statements of
Sales & Loss

L.S.G.

16.1.99

Pet 603 P2 enclosure & cover 26/1/99

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

[redacted] DEPARTMENT

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 1208 dated January 99 received at the Dewan's Office from Gangaram Sah contract Canada shops Doregaum Bowringpet Salute Comm complaining of the loss which he is put to owing to the hate of the Sunday Shandy to Soon Kuppam and praying that he may be allowed to open a Shop at Soonikuppam on Sunda is forwarded, together with its ~~two~~ three enclosure & to the ~~Deputy~~ Commissioner of ~~the Kolar~~ [illegible] ~~Districts~~ for disposal.

By order,

for ~~Secretary.~~

BANGALORE,
25/1/1899
26
23/1/99

Recd with letter & Encls
26/1/99

Two Rs stamp affixed to petn

Transferred to the Excise Branch

24. 7. 99 Asst Secretary

J. Ex Comr for disposal

24/7/99

Com
Put up
Fol 25-7-99
Sign Both put up
Fol

1899 (3)

No. 140.

Name of Petitioner Pailovany & Gang. Arrack contractors

Village Bowringapet.

Taluk

District Kolar.

Date of Arzi 16-7-99.

Date of Receipt 17-7-99.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

ABSTRACT

State that they had tak contract of 5 arrack shops Corgaum & Bowringapet all the shops in Mulur for the year 1898-99 for (28000 + 6000) = 34000; that plague having broken out in the villages, the inhab were asked by the plague Thonlis to evacuate the whereby their arrack dra suffered very much fo want of Customers; th In addition many gāt

which they used to have
such sale of arrack were stopped &
they had to advance money to
the Vendors to the amount of
Rs 6000 for keeping the shops open
during plague times, they had
to remove these shops outside
the village (whereby causing
much loss of material &c) & they
had to close some of the shops
by 7 or 8 P.M apart from closing
entirely many shops in Malwa &
that owing to the above causes
they have suffered a total
loss of Rs 20491-1-4 as seen
from the enclosed statement of
that though they complained
about this, to the higher au-
thorities, no steps have been
taken as yet.

Pray for the remission of the
heavy loss they have sustained
for the whole year, Rs 20491-1-4.

Enc. Statement - Shewing
the quantity of
the arrack sold money
received, expenses &c

SM
21/7/99
RP 22/7/99

Pet
70 P2

(4)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 140 dated 16-7-9 received at the Dewan's Office from Paloosay & Sangaraw Sah, Contractors, Bowringpet, praying for a remission on account of the great-~~ness~~ loss they sustained on account Plague &c

A fifteen contract amount

is forwarded, together with its one enclosure, to the ~~Deputy Commissioner of~~ ~~District,~~ ~~for disposal~~ Excise Commr for disposal

By order,

Bgl

BANGALORE, 25/7/1899

for Secretary.

Refer

17.1.1900

1400 Revenue No 325/7/98

Revenue

17/1/1900

Rep. find. enp

All

18/1/900

To be forwarded to the Excise Commissioner in continuation

22.1.1900 Asst Secretary

Ex Comm's order not received

Ref 23/1/00

Complete

23/1/00

-1-1900

1899 (5)

No. 1340 Pyloorung and Ganga

Name of Petitioner Contractors of arrack shops in Oorgaum

Village Bowringpet

Taluk Malur Tk.

District Kolar

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 8-1-1900

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

ABSTRACT

Pray that their previous petn complaining of the loss of Rs 2049-1-4 they sustained in the contract of the arrack shops in Oorgaum, Bowringpet & other villages in the Malur Taluk and may be pleased to remit the remission they prayed for & may be granted

One copy of the previous petn

Sm
16/1/1900

RC 6

4708
Ex 208

Excise] (6) 1900-1901.

From

The Excise Commissioner,
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

Dated 9th January
Despatched 10 — do } 1901
Received

General No. 3747
No. 191 Enclosure No. 1

In reply to Secretary's official memo Nos
bearing date 25th January 1899 and 90
dated 28th July 1899.

SUBJECT.

Submits a compensation Statement for Rs 2039-3-0 for sanction and transmission to the Comptroller for audit in favor of Palovasy and Ganga-ram salt licensees of certain separate arrack shops in the Bowringpet Taluk and Rent farms in the Malur Taluk for the year 1898-99

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Rs 17/1/01

10.1.01

Submitted

As the previous references were made by the Petition Branch, may this be transferred to that Branch? for disposal or putting up connected papers?

15/1/01

Petition Branch.

Please put up the previous papers with

19/1/01

Please put up Cts Nos 1340 of 8.1—1901

11/1/01

Excise Br.

Ref? put up

18/1/01

21/1/01

Excise Commissioners' Office,

Bangalore. 9th January 1901

From

The Excise Commissioner,
in Mysore.

To,

The Secretary to Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to your official memos. Nos. 503, dated 25th January 1899, and 70, dated 28th July 1899, forwarding petitions from Kaloosing and Gangaram Saib, licensees of certain separate arrack shops in the Bowringpet Taluk and of Kund farms in the Malur Taluk, for the year 1898-1899, I have the honor to state that the petitioners pray for a remission of Rs 20,491-0-0 as per following particulars given in their statement:—

| Taluk. | Quantity of arrack consumed in 1898-99 as per petitioners' statement | amount realised at the rate of profit allowed by govt. Rs 1-3-8 per gallon | | | Deduct: Rents to Government | | | Deduct: other expenses. | | | Total | | | Loss. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Gallons | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p |
| Bowringpet | 10128 | 12,449 | 1 | 2 | 2751 0 | .. | .. | 1650 | .. | .. | 29160 | .. | .. | 16710 | 14 | 10 |
| Malur | 3711 | 4561 | 6 | 10 | 6116 | .. | .. | 2225 | 8 | .. | 8341 | 8 | .. | 3780 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 13,839 | 17010 | 8 | .. | 33626 | .. | .. | 3875 | 8 | .. | 37,501 | 8 | .. | 20,491 | .. | .. |

2. In connection with this subject it has to be considered whether the petitioners purchased the shops and farms at any profit to themselves or for a mere speculation. The following statistics exhibit that they bought them purely for speculation, since they reserved no margin for their profit, but purchased them at a loss of Rs 13090-13-0 calculated on the Consumption for the year 1897-98:—

| Taluk. | Consumption in 1897-98 | amount expected to be realised at Rs 1-3-8 per gallon in 1898-99 | | | amount of rent for which purchased by petitioners for 1898-99 | | | approximate Cost of vend | | | Total expenditure | | | Loss. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Gallons | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p | Rs | as | p |
| Bowringpet | 13401 | 16472 | 1 | .. | 27510 | .. | .. | 600 | .. | .. | 28110 | .. | .. | 11637 | 15 | .. |
| Malur | 4770 | 5863 | 2 | .. | 6116 | .. | .. | 1200 | .. | .. | 7316 | .. | .. | 1452 | 14 | .. |
| Total | 18171 | 22335 | 3 | .. | 33626 | .. | .. | 1800 | .. | .. | 35426 | .. | .. | 13090 | 13 | .. |

3. In accordance with the correct figures in this office, the petitioners seem to have sustained a loss of Rs 5212-14-4 for the year 1898-99. as per particulars below:— (C)

| Taluk | Correct arrack Consumption in 1898-1899. | amount realized at the Rate of profit allowed by Govt viz 3-8 per gallon | Deduct. Khista to Government | Cost of Vend | Total expenses | Loss. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Gallons Drs | Rs as P | Rs as P | Rs as P | Rs as P | Rs as P |
| Bowringpet | 10,820 0 | 12,685 0 0 | 27,510 .. .. | 600 .. .. | 28,110 .. .. | 15,425 .. .. |
| Malur | 3610 0 | 4437 4 8 | 6116 .. .. | 1200 .. .. | 7316 .. .. | 2878 11 4 |
| Total | 13930 0 | 17,122 4 8 | 33626 .. .. | 1800 .. .. | 35426 .. .. | 18303 11 4 |

Deduct the loss at which the petitioners purchased the shops and farms at the auction sale . . . . } 13,090-13-0

Real loss Rs. 5212-14-4

But most of this loss is due to the petitioners not having made proper arrangements for the sale of arrack during the prevalence of plague in the Bowringpet and Malur Taluks. They are, however, entitled to compensation on account of the prohibition

of

of jatras and fairs ordered by Government within the petitioners' areas, as per under-mentioned details. In other similar instances the Government has been pleased to grant remission of shop rent.

(P)

| Taluk | Name of jatra prohibited in petitioners' area | Average Consumption during the previous three years. | Compensation at Rs 1-3-8 per gallon the rate of gross profit allowed by Govt. (Rs 6-6-0 minus 4-12-0 + 0-6-4 = Rs 1-3-8). | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Gallons | Rs | as | P. |
| Bowringpet | Bowringpet | 55 | 67 | 9 | 8 |
| | Peddapalli | 122 | 149 | 15 | 4 |
| Malur | Tirupati | 60 | 73 | 12 | 0 |
| | Thamahalli | 38 | 46 | 11 | 4 |
| | Taikal | 15 | 18 | 7 | 0 |
| | Malur and Lakkur | 35 | 43 | 0 | 4 |
| | Total. | 325 | 399 | 7 | 8 |
| Add decrease in Consumption in petitioners' shops nos 9 and 10 in Gotigam owing to the removal of Shandy (weekly fair) and of 30 families of drinking classes from petitioners' area | | 1334 | 1639 | 11 | 4 |
| | Grand Total | 1659 | 2039 | 3 | 0 |

Accordingly a Compensation statement

for

for Rs 2039- 3-0 is herewith submitted for sanction and transmission to the Comptroller for audit.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant.

Excise Commissioner

&c - in Mysore.

Read again —

petitions regd nos 1208 and 140 dated January 1899 and 14th July 1899 respectively from Paloorsing and Gangaram said, ~~Abkari Contractors, Bowring~~ praying for a remission of Rs 20,491-8-0 being the amount of loss alleged to have been sustained by them on account of ~~plague and~~ plague restrictions ~~during~~ ~~the years (1898-99)~~

* licensees of certain separate arrack shops in the Bowringpet ~~taluk~~ taluk ~~for 1898-99~~, and of the vend farms in the malur taluk for 1898-99

Read:-

Also letter no $\frac{3747}{191}$ 8 9th January 1901, from the Excise Commr in Mysore stating, with reference to this office nos 603 dated 25th January 1899 and 70, dated 28th July 1899, that ~~a~~ ~~the~~ greater portion of the loss said to have been incurred by the licensees

was chiefly due to their
initial indiscriminate bid for speculative purposes
~~with the object of speculation~~
and to the subsequent failure
on their part to make proper
arrangements for the sale of
arrack in their shops during
the prevalence of plague and
~~recommending~~ submitting for
sanction a compensation
statement for favor of the licensees
for Rs 2039-3-4 on the
ground that that ~~is~~ was the only
amount of compensation to
which the petetioners were entitled
on account of the prohibition
of gubias and fairs within the
Contract area, as well as on account
of the decrease in consumption
in the licensees' shops nos 9 & 10
at Dorigam owing to the removal
of weekly fair & of 30 families
of drinking classes from that
place.

Order

No: 6076-7
Ex 295
dt 13/2/07
13.

Order thereon:—

Government are pleased to sanction a Compensation of Rs 2039-3-4 (two thousand thirty nine rupees three annas four pies) being the consideration to which the licensees are reasonably entitled under the circumstances noted by the Excise Commr.

as recommended, ←

The statement of compensation received with the Excise Commr's letter read above is returned for retransmission with the Treasury officers certificate in proof of the amount having been duly credited in the Kolar District Treasury.

12/2/07
for Secretary

12/2/07

To The Excise Commr
returning the Compensation statement
The Comptroller, m.y.

Endorsement (8)

No: 6078 dt 13/2/01.
Ex 296 13.

In reply to their petitions Reqd nos 1208 & 140 dated January 1899 & 14th July 99 respectively praying for a remission of Rs 20,491/- on account of the loss alleged to have been sustained by them owing to ~~plague~~ plague restrictions, poloosing and Sangaramsari licenses of certain separate arrack shops in the Bowringpet Taluk and of Vend farms in the Malur Taluk for 1898-99 are informed that a Compensation of Rs 2039-3-- has been sanctioned ~~on~~ in their favor ~~under~~ ~~actual~~ is the only amount to which they are reasonably entitled under the circumstances

Recommended by the Executive Committee in Inquiries.

"B O"

12/2/07

For Secretary

KG
11/2/07

Reference

23/3/01

File ending with B/Rs
Nos: 13408 8-1-01 regarding receipt
copy for Exc Nos 4708 dt 9-1-01
Exc 208
from Excise Comm^r, letter
No. 3747 and sent to
191
Excise Br on 18-1-01

B/Rs Transferred to
27/3 Excise Branch in
continuation.

27-3-01

27/3/01

Submitted with office note
continued.

30/3/01

Subd to the 2^d^ dft

30/3/01

1900

646

No. 1866 (4)

Name of Petitioner Palooring & Gou
Salt Licensees of the

Village Shops in the Bowring

Taluk and of Vard fo

Taluk in the Malur Taluk,

District Year 1898–1899

Date of Arzi 18–3–01

Date of Receipt 19–3–01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

With reference to the Hon
endorsement No 6078/Exc-2
dated 13–2–01, informing the
that a compensation of Rs
has been sanctioned in their
favour, the petitioners ap
that, on account of the outb
of plague and other circum
over which they have no con
they have suffered the heav
loss of Rs 20,491

They pray that an opportu
may be given them to repres
the complicated matter to Gov
by an advocate, they being inu

both English and Canarese,
and that, after a perusal
of the records, a further reasonable
concession may be shown them.

Ex J
23/12



18662
19-3-1901

*To*

THE HONOURABLE THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF

H. H. THE MAHARANEE REGENT OF MYSORE.

*The Humble Petition of* **Paloosing and Gangaram Sait,** *Licensees of some separate Arrack Shops in the Bowringpett Taluk and of Vend farms in the Maloor Taluk for the year 1898—1899.*

**Respectfully Showeth :—**

1. That the Petitioners have duly received endorsement No. 6078/Ex.—296 dated 13th February 1901, from the Secretary to the Government of Mysore, informing them in reply to their previous petitions that a compensation of Rupees 2,039—3—0 has been sanctioned in their favour.

2. That on seeing the Excise Commissioner and representing their heavy losses owing to the outbreak of plague and very strict measures adopted by Government and the villagers themselves to prevent people going from infected towns and villages to uninfected places, he told them that he had recommended for them the grant of a compensation on account of the loss which they suffered in consequence of the prohibition of Jatras and fairs and demolition of cooly lines within the limits of their shops. Accordingly the compensation of Rupees 2,039—3—0 referred to in the above endorsement, appears to have been sanctioned in favour of the Petitioners on account of the loss sustained by them in consequence of the stoppage of Jatras and fairs and destruction of cooly lines.

3. That the Petitioners in acknowledging their obligations to Government for the grant of the above compensation, respectfully beg to bring the following circumstances into your indulgent reconsideration.

4. That the Petitioners represented to the Excise Commissioner also that they sustained a loss of Rs. 20,491—0—0.

5. In reply he pointed out that the amounts of their bids compared with arrack consumption for 1897—1898 showed that they purchased the shops at a loss of Rupees 13,000—0—0 and that therefore the alleged loss was not due entirely to plague restrictions. On comparing the amount of bids for 1898—1899 of the arrack farms under question it will be seen that they have purchased the shops only, at a loss of 6,064 Rupees over that for 1897—1898 and not Rupees 13,000—0—0. But the Petitioners seeing that arrack consumption was increasing year after year, and that gold industry was also increasing, they believed that arrack consumption in 1898—99 would be far more than in 1897—1898, and therefore offered the very

large sum of Rupees 33,626—0—0. But unfortunately for them, plague broke out in Gold Fields, as well as at Bowringpett, Maloor, and other important places, and arrack consumption instead of rising as they anticipated, fell off from 18,171 gallons in 1897—1898 to 13,930 gallons in 1898—1899 in Petitioners' shops. This was entirely due to circumstances over which they had no control.

6. That it will be seen from the statistics of the following shops which did not suffer from plague out of those purchased by them, the Petitioners correctly anticipated increased consumption for the year 1898—1899, and that they were not wreckless in their bids.

| Taluk. | Name of shops. | Arrack consumptions in 1897—1898 gallons. | Arrack consumptions in 1898—1899 gallons. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maloor ... | Taikal ... | 200 | ... 203 |
| | Haldanhalli ... | 177 | ... 228 |
| | Kantur .... | 111 | ... 153 |

7. If plague had not broken out, there would have been an increase similarly in all the shops purchased by the Petitioners.

8. That plague is a calamity which has befallen owing to the visitation of God, and accordingly it is an event over which the Petitioners had no control. For the loss which Abkary contractors sustained in the Bombay Presidency, the Bombay Government has been freely granting remissions.

9. That even if the loss of Rupees 6,064—0—0 at which the Petitioners purchased the shops, be deducted from the actual total loss of Rupees 20,491—0—0 sustained by the Petitioners, there would still be a difference of Rupees 14,427—0—0. But the Government has been pleased to grant a compensation of Rupees 2,039—3—0 only which does not make up the interest they have been paying.

10. That the Petitioners have almost been ruined in their business in consequence of their heavy loss of Rupees 20,491—0—0 in the above transactions.

11. Two shops of the Petitioners opposite to the Bowringpett Railway Station were forcibly removed by the Excise Supervisor, under the orders of the Deputy Commissioner to a distance of 3 furlongs from the Station and people getting down the train were ordered to go to plague sheds; and were prohibited from going to any other places than sheds.

12. In the villages of Malur Talook, where the Petitioners had shops, the villagers vacated the villages entirely by order of the District Magistrate and people were told not to enter the villages. The shops were forcibly removed to Jungles where they could not be kept, after 6 P. M., and people in consequence were not frequenting them.

13. The people were forcibly removed from Oorigam, where the Petitioners had 3 shops, which were forcibly removed to a distance of a furlong from the village.

14. Hundred families removed from Oorigam to Sornakoppa one shopkeeper of Oorigam by name Nagappa was a partner of Moony Venkatasawmy a shopkeeper of Sornakoppa who had an increase of sale in his shop; under these circumstances the Petitioners suffered heavy loss.

15. The Excise Commissioner did not take into consideration the above facts and the papers in the record clearly show the heavy loss of Rs. 20,191 an account of the reasons given above.

They therefore humbly pray that after a kind perusal of their records in this case which has been taking place for the last nearly 3 years, a further reasonable concession to make up the loss may be granted to them.

Petitioners, further, humbly pray that an opportunity may be given to them to be heard by an advocate on their behalf, as the matter is very complicated and the Petitioners do not know English or Canarese to explain the matter themselves fully.

For which act of benevolence Petitioners, shall as in duty bound ever pray.

BANGALORE,
*14th March 1901.*

Encl

No 1594 / Ex 389 — 82 — 2 — 4. 1901

(10)

C. of f. Memorandum.

Petition Registered No. 1866 dated 18th March 1901 from Palaoseng and Ganparamsaeh, licensees of certain arrack shops in the Bowringpet & Malur Taluks for 1899-99 representing with reference to Govt. order No. 6076-7 / Ex 295 dated 13th February 1901, that, for reasons stated in their petition they sustained a heavy loss of Rs 20 4 9 1/2 and praying for a further reasonable Concession - is forwarded to the Excise Commr. in Mysore, for report on the several allegations therein made together with the entire records of the case.

"B. O."

for Secy

Ex 313

Excise]




11

From

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF MYSORE,

General and Revenue Depts.

Dated 15th April 1901.

Despatched 18 —do

Received

General No. 5413

No. 276

Enclosure No. 13 as per list

In reply to the Secretary's official Memo No 7894 / Ex 399, dated 2nd April 1901,

SUBJECT.

submits his report on the petition of Paloosing and Gangaramsait, licensees of arrack vend farms in the Malur taluk and the Bowringpet taluk for the year 1898-99, praying for further concession on account of the loss sustained by them in consequence of plague

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

2
18.4.01

Submitted with office note
Contd. read together with papers
& papers connected with the case

KG
4/5/01.

No. 5-413/276 Encl 13 as per list

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, Dated 15th April 18

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your official Memo. No. 7894/Ex. 389, dated 2nd instant, forwarding for report a petition from Palooring and Gangaramsait, licensees of certain arrack shops in the Bowringpet taluk and vend farms in the Malur taluk for the year 1898-99, representing with reference to Government order No. 6076-7/Ex. 295, dated 13th February 1901, in which a compensation of Rs 2039-3-0 has been sanctioned in the petitioners' favour, that they have sustained a heavy loss of Rs. 20,491/- owing to plague, and praying for a further concession, I have the honor to state that under the terms of the petitioners' contract, "no remission or abatement of the rent

rent or compensation shall, on any account whatever, be claimable by the licensees." Accordingly the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, with reference to the petitioners' representations for remission of Vend rent, stated that he was not in favour of recommending any remission, as it would form an inconvenient precedent, and if granted in this case, would have to be granted throughout the Province, causing an enormous expenditure to Government, coupled with the loss under stillhead duty owing to short issues from the Distillery. In reply, the Deputy Commissioner was informed that Government recognised the fairness of deserved consideration being shown in cases where losses were sustained by the lessees in consequence of the prohibition of Jatras and fairs and demolition of hamlets within their limits and transfer of fairs from their limits; and was requested to submit a compensation Statement in the petitioners' favour if any loss on such grounds had been

been sustained by the petitioners. Accordingly he sent a Statement for the grant of a compensation of Rs. 2039-3-0 in favour of the petitioners, being the amount of loss which accrued to them owing to the prohibition of certain jatras and to the removal of a weekly fair and thirty families of drinking classes from the petitioners' area. This was recommended to Government in my letter No. $\frac{3741}{191}$, dated 9th January 1901, and the Government sanctioned it in Proceedings No. $\frac{6016-7}{8x.295-}$, dated 13th February 1901.

2. The petitioners allege that they have sustained a total loss of Rs. 20,401-0-0. In my letter No. $\frac{3741}{191}$, dated 9th January 1901, I have shown how they have arrived at this incorrect figure; and that the actual loss is correctly calculated, is Rs. 18,303-11-4.

3. They state that they purchased the shops only at a loss of Rs. 6064/-, over the amount of rent for the year 1897-98. The difference between the rents of the year 1898-99, Viz. Rs. 33,626/- and those of the year 1897-98, Viz. Rs 27,530, being Rs 6,096 (and not Rs. 6,064), they evidently mean that they purchased the shops for Rs. 6,096 more than the rent of the year 1897-98. But

the

the value of shops is always calculated upon arrack consumption in them. By so calculating it, I have shown in my aforesaid letter that they bought the shops at a loss of Rs. 13,090-13-0 for speculation purposes. Deducting this amount from the aggregate loss of Rs 18,303-11-4, the balance is Rs. 5,212-14-0. I have stated that most of this loss is due to the petitioners not having made proper arrangements for the sale of arrack during the prevalence of plague in the Bowringpet and Malur taluks. They kept the Lakkur shop in the Malur taluk closed for ten days and Thornahalli shop in the same taluk for three months. Consequently there was a decrease of 209 gallons of arrack in the Lakkur shop, and 70 gallons in the Thornahalli shop, or a total of 279 gallons, resulting in a loss of Rs. 1325-1/4 to Government. In the Bangalore city, proper arrangements having been made for the sale of arrack during the year 1898-99 when plague prevailed virulently, the fall in arrack consumption was only 2·1 per cent. If the petitioners had similarly exerted themselves in the Bowringpet and Malur talukes, the decline in arrack consumption in their shops would not have been so high as 23·34 per cent.

4. The increase in arrack consumption in the shops referred to in para 6 of their petition, is due to the fact that the villages in which they are situated, were quite free from plague, and therefore some of the consumers who used to resort to the shops in infected villages, went to the former.

5. The Supervisor of the Bowringpet Range states that when plague broke out at Bowringpet and Oorigam, the inhabitants camped out under the District Deputy Commissioner's Orders, and the arrack shops also were located outside the towns for the convenience of the arrack consumers; that similarly the shops in infected areas in the Malur taluk were located in places where the inhabitants had their sheds; and that in these rural shops it was quite safe and convenient to carry on the sales till 8 P.M. as usual.

6. The Deputy Commissioner has reported that the coolies who were living in thirty sheds, were removed from Oorigam. The petitioners seem to think that one hundred families lived in these sheds. Taking on an average three arrack consumers for each shed, and two drams of arrack per day for each member, the total quantity of the fall for 12 months would be 1288 gallons and 12 drams. The Deputy Commissioner entered on this account a

loss

loss of 1334 gallons in the compensation Statement. Accordingly the petitioners have no cause for any grievance.

7. Under the above circumstances I do not feel inclined to recommend any further concession in favour of the petitioners.

8. I may add that many representations have been received for remission of Government dues on the ground of losses owing to plague and cholera generally. If concession be granted in one instance on such general grounds, it would have to be granted in every taluk where plague or cholera or both broke out.

9. The records of the case are herewith sent with a Tenist, (together with the appeal petition)

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

List of papers relating to Pailusing and Gangaram sait, arrack Contractors, Bowringpet and Malur taluks for 1898-99, submitted to the Secretary to the Government of Mysore with the Excise Commissioner's No. 5413 dated 15 April 1901.

276

18 11/a

## Particulars.

1. Memo of Kolar District Assistant Commissioner, dated 28th October 1898, with the Deputy Commissioner's Orders thereon and all connected papers.
2. Memo of Excise Supervisor Rajendraum Pillay, dated 17th January 1899 and 27th March 1899 with Deputy Commissioner's Orders thereon and all connected papers.
3. Petition of Pailusing sait dated 12th April 1899 addressed to the Excise Commissioner with enclosures.
4. Bowringpet Range Supervisor's No. 10, dated 8th July 1899 addressed to the Deputy Commissioner Kolar with enclosures.
5. Petition of Pailusing sait dated 14th July 1899 addressed to the Dewan of Mysore.
6. Kolar Deputy Commissioner's No. 123/3, dated 29th July 1899 addressed to the Bowringpet Range Supervisor with enclosure.
7. Bowringpet Range Supervisor's No. 65, dated 2nd August 1899 addressed to the Kolar Deputy Commissioner with enclosure.
8. Kolar District Excise Asst. Commissioner's No. 618, dated 3rd October 1899 addressed to the Deputy Commissioner Kolar, with enclosures.
9. Bowringpet Range Supervisor's No. 125, dated 5th October 1899, addressed to the Deputy Commissioner Kolar with enclosures.
10. Petition of Pailusing sait dated 18th January 1900 addressed to the Excise Commissioner with enclosures.
11. Bowringpet Range Supervisor's No. 621 dated 10th September 1900, addressed to the Kolar District Deputy Commissioner with enclosure.
12. Petition of Pailoosing sait dated 21st September 1900, addressed to the Excise Commissioner
13. Memo of Excise Inspector Rajendraum Pillay

Venkatadasappa
For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Draft as per abstract

(12)

Read again:—

Government proc$^{s}$
no. 6076-7 / Ex 295 dated 13$^{th}$
February 1901 sanctioning
a compensation of Rs 2039-3-$^{a}$
as recommended by the
Excise Comm$^{r}$ in favour of the paloosing and
Gunparum Sett, licensees
of certain arrack shops in
the Bowringpet & malur Taluk
for 1898-99, on account of
loss ~~sus~~ caused to them
by plague & plague re-
strictions

Read the following papers:—

Petition recd no. 1866 ~~dated~~
dated 18$^{th}$ march 1901 from
paloosing and Gunparum Sett,
licensees of arrack shops
in the Bowringpet & malur
Taluks for 1898-99, praying
that, for reasons stated

in their petition they may
be shown further concession

Letter no. 5413/276 dated
15th April 1901 from the
Excise Commr. in mysore, reporting
~~stating~~ with reference to
this office no. 7894/Ex 389 32nd
April 1901 that, ~~for reasons~~
~~stated in his letter~~, the
~~licensees (petitioners)~~ he
is not inclined to recommend
any further concession
in favor of the petitioners,
as the concession already
granted in Govt. Proc. ~~referred~~
read above is fair and the
heavy loss complained of
by the licensees was due to
their not having made proper
arrangements for the sale
of arrack in their shops during the
year 1898-99
~~during the time of~~
when plague prevailed
in the Bowringpet &

Malwa Taluka.

No 9548-9 / Rev. 7.10-99 dt. 28/5/01

Rev 13 files.

Order thereon :—

Government agree with the Excise Commr. that no remission or refund over and above that already sanctioned ~~vide Govt Procs~~ read above by way of Concession is admissible. petitioners have failed to make out that the loss caused to them by the interference of the plague or other authorities was larger than the amount covered by the refund sanctioned in Govt Procs read above, and the petition is accordingly rejected

23/5/01

for Secretary

dft/6

KG 20/5/01

To The Excise Commr returning records.
" Comptroller, m/s

Draft to be sent

13

Endorsement

No: 9550 dt 28/5/01.
Qu. 7-10-99

In reply to their petition dated Rept no. 1866 dated 18th March 1901, praying that for reasons stated in their petition, a further reasonable concession may be shown to them considering the heavy loss they sustained on account of certain arrack shops in the Bowringpet & malur Taluks owing to plague & plague restrictions, Palooring and Gangaram sent, licensees of arrack shops in the Bowringpet and malur Taluks for 1899-99, are informed that their petition is rejected as they (petitioners)

have failed to make out that the loss caused to them by the interference of the plague or other authorities was larger than the amount covered by the refund sanctioned in Govt. proc. no. 6076-7 & 13 Ex 295 February 1901.

"B. O."

23/5/01

For Secretary

KG
20/5/01.

Submitted,

The petitioner means that the entire record received from the Excise Commr in connection with his (petitioner's) case should be given to him.

29/6/07

We cannot grant this

29/6/07

The petitioner was verbally informed of it.

29/6/07




14

From Puttappa Hanagavadi

To

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GEN. & REV. DEPTS.

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

Praying for the return of all the papers that be filed in connection with the petition No: 6078 of Ex 296.

References to be marked.



To

The Honourable the Executive

Council of H. H. The Maharaja

Regent of Mysore

Petition No. of 1900-91

The petitioner prays that he may be returned all the papers that he filed in Connection with the petition No. 6078 & 296

(Sd) Pailandiah Gangaram.